3A.14 PUBLIC SERVICES - LAND

3A.14.1 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES

Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District

The Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District (SMFD) currently provides fire protection services to approximately 3,406 acres of the SPA. SMFD offers fire protection, fire suppression, inspection, plan checking, emergency transportation and medical services, public education, advanced life support, and rescue services to the unincorporated portions of Sacramento County. SMFD was formed in 2000 by consolidation of the American River Fire District and the Sacramento County Fire Protection District. As the largest fire district in Sacramento County, SMFD currently operates 42 stations and provides service through 750 uniformed and support personnel to nearly 600,000 people in a 417-square-mile area. SMFD operates 10 transporting Advanced Life Support medics, 7 reserve transporting medics, 38 engine companies, 5 truck companies, 24 grass engines, 2 crash rescue rigs, 6 water tenders, 4 swift water rescue bikes, 5 swift water rescue inflatable rubber boats, 5 air units, three reserve firefighter engine companies, and 2 reserve firefighter grass engines (SMFD 2009). Many of SMFD's engines are paramedic staffed and all responding units provide coverage by emergency medical technicians. SMFD's personnel are trained and equipped to deal not only with emergency medical alarms and structural or wildland fires, but also with swift water emergencies, confined space incidents, technical rescues, hazardous materials incidents, and crash fire rescue. In 2004, SMFD responded to more than 60,000 alarms, providing a response time of six minutes or less greater than 90% of the time (SMFD 2007). The nearest SMFD facility to the SPA is Station 63 located at 12395 Folsom Boulevard, approximately 5.1 miles west of the SPA via Prairie City Road and U.S. Highway 50 (U.S. 50).

City of Folsom Fire Department

Upon annexation of the SPA, fire protection services within the SMFD service area would become the responsibility of the City of Folsom Fire Department. The department has 74 employees that provide fire protection and emergency medical services to approximately 65,000 people in a 24-square-mile area (City of Folsom Fire Department 2009a). Fire fighting personnel are typically assigned on a three-shift work schedule, which provides the city with coverage 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The department maintains four fire stations within the City:

- Station 35—535 Glenn Drive
- Station 36—9700 Oak Avenue Parkway
- Station 37—70 Clarksville Road
- Station 38—1300 Blue Ravine Road

The department is equipped with one 65-foot aerial ladder truck, three Type III grass engines, two transporting ambulances, an air support unit, an OES engine, a hazmat decon trailer, an inflatable rescue boat, a Community Emergency Response Team support trailer, and staff vehicles (Haverty, pers. comm., 2009). Currently the department provides paramedic/advanced life support services from all four stations using cross-trained firefighter/paramedics. The department participates in a countywide resource deployment plan that ensures the closest available emergency crew responds to the scene of emergencies, regardless of geographic boundaries. The department responds to over 5,400 requests for service annually, an average of 14.8 per day. The City of Folsom currently requires 1.6 fire staff per 1,000 residents.

The Insurance Services Office (ISO) rating is the recognized classification for a fire department or district's ability to defend against major fires. According to the ISO, newly developing urban areas should have a fire station opened within 1.5 miles of all commercial development and 2.5 miles from all residential development when

"build-out" exceeds 20% of the planning area. A rating of 10 generally indicates no protection, whereas an ISO rating of 1 indicates high firefighting capability. The department's ISO rating is currently a class 3.

First-response service to the SPA would be provided by Station 37 at 70 Clarksville Road, approximately 1.6 miles north of the SPA via Scott Road. Station 37 is staffed with five fire fighting personnel (Haverty, pers. comm., 2009).

The City of Folsom Fire Department, in cooperation with the City of Folsom Parks and Recreation Department, is constructing the new Station 39 to serve the northern and eastern portions of the City and some portions of El Dorado Hills. The station is located at Empire Ranch Road and Ritchie Street and is being planned as a three-phased project. The 10,500-square-foot facility will house a three-person engine company able to respond with a structural engine, wildland engine, and reserve ambulance (City of Folsom 2009b). This station would close a response performance gap currently being served primarily by crews from Fire Stations 37 and 38. Station 39 is planned to be operational in 2010 (Haverty, pers. comm., 2009).

El Dorado Hills Fire Department

The El Dorado Hills Fire Department (EDHFD) serves approximately 178 acres of the northeastern portion of the SPA as a multi-jurisdictional district. The EDHFD has 66 paid employees and 38 volunteers that provide fire protection and emergency medical services 24 hours a day, 7 days a week (EDHFD 2009). The department maintains four fire stations:

- Station 84—2180 Francisco Drive
- Station 85—1050 Wilson Boulevard
- Station 86—3670 Bass Lake Road
- Station 87—4680 Golden Foothill Parkway

The EDHFD is equipped with ten engines, one air/light support unit, one water tender, three medic units and one Quint (ladder truck) (EDHFD 2009). Currently the EDHFD provides emergency medical/advanced life support; residential, commercial, and wildland fire suppression; hazardous materials safety; fire prevention code enforcement; public education; and community services. The ISO rating for the EDHFD is currently a Class 3 in areas within five miles of a fire station, Class 8 in areas within five miles of a fire station but more than 1,000 feet from a fire hydrant, and Class 10 in areas more than five miles from a fire station (El Dorado County Fire Prevention Officers 2009). In 2008, the EDHFD responded to over 2,500 requests for service (EDHFD 2008). The EDHFD serves approximately 42,000 people, which would result in a ratio of 2.1 fire staff per 1,000 residents.

First-response service to the SPA within the EDHFD would be provided by Station 85 at 1050 Wilson Boulevard, approximately 1.2 miles northeast of the SPA via Latrobe Road in the unincorporated portion of El Dorado County.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Law enforcement services for the SPA are currently provided by the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department North Division. The North Division provides patrol and investigative services to the communities of Carmichael, Fair Oaks, Foothill Farms, Orangevale, and other unincorporated areas of Sacramento County (County). The division is staffed by over 100 sworn officers and 19 support staff. The patrol officers and detectives serving these areas work out of the Garfield Station at 5510 Garfield Avenue, approximately 16.6 miles southwest of the SPA. The North Division also maintains the Fair Oaks/Orangevale Community Service Center located at 8525 Madison Avenue, approximately 8.8 miles northwest of the SPA. It is staffed with a Sergeant, Problem-Oriented Policing Officers, a Crime Prevention Specialist, an office manager, and a staff of volunteers. This center assists the community through the organization and presentation of community meetings, helping to establish Business and

Neighborhood Watch programs, taking reports, and providing public assistance and information at the front counter (Sacramento County Sheriff's Department 2009).

Upon annexation of the SPA, law enforcement services would become the responsibility of the City of Folsom Police Department. The department has 125 employees including officers and support staff (City of Folsom Police Department 2009). The police station is located at 49 Natoma Street, approximately 5 miles northeast of the SPA via Prairie City Road. The City of Folsom currently requires 1.3 police officers per 1,000 residents.

The City of Folsom's Field Operations Division is staffed with 68 personnel and is the largest division within the police department. It is comprised of the Patrol Bureau, Traffic Bureau, Mounted Unit, K-9 Unit, School Resource Officers, Crime Scene Investigation Unit, and Special Weapons and Tactic Team. The primary functions of the Field Operations Division are to provide prompt response to community requests for police assistance and to implement proactive measures that reduce and prevent criminal activity through comprehensive community policing.

One important measurement of service delivery is response time to emergency calls-for-service. The Police Department Service Delivery Plan calls for emergency call response within five minutes or less for Priority One calls. A Priority One call is a violent crime against a person or an emergency requiring an immediate response to save a life. In 2006, the response time for the first unit on the scene was approximately seven minutes and the response time for a second unit was nine minutes. In general, response times for the first unit increased by three seconds, while the second unit response time decreased by 28 seconds. Overall, response times have decreased but remain higher than the department's goal of five minutes or less for two officers responding to priority calls for service (City of Folsom Police Department 2006).

Any traffic complaints, concerns, or collisions occurring outside of the Folsom City boundaries and within the unincorporated area of Sacramento County are handled by the California Highway Patrol (CHP). CHP is responsible for providing patrols on all interstate freeways and highways in California. CHP has numerous offices throughout California and can be contacted directly to report accidents, hazards, and other traffic related inquiries. The SPA is located within the Valley Division, which oversees Interstate 80, Interstate 5, U.S. 50, and State Route 99. The Valley Division includes 16 area offices, three resident posts, one commercial inspection facility, one transportation management center, three communications/dispatch centers and is staffed with 785 uniformed officers and 250 non-uniformed personnel (CHP 2008).

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The SPA is located in the Folsom Cordova Unified School District (FCUSD). Located in eastern Sacramento County, the district covers 95 square miles. The FCUSD boundaries encompass the City of Folsom, portions of the City of Rancho Cordova, and portions of the unincorporated areas of Sacramento County (FCUSD 2008b:A-1). FCUSD currently operates 21 elementary schools, 4 middle schools, 3 comprehensive high schools, 2 continuation high schools, and 4 adult and alternative education centers (FCUSD 2008b:A-1). FCUSD had a 2008–2009 school year enrollment of 19,119 students and the current school capacity is 19,932 students (Education Data Partnership 2009a, FCUSD 2008b:A-1). The district expects to reach 21,561 students by the 2012–1013 school year (FCUSD 2008a:14).

The FCUSD has experienced considerable growth in the past few years that has affected the ability to provide adequate educational facilities. A new elementary school, Navigator Elementary, was opened in August 2006 in the Rancho Cordova portion of the district and a second elementary school, Russell Ranch Elementary, was opened in August 2007 in Folsom. A new high school, Vista del Lago High, was opened in August 2007 in Folsom to relieve crowding at Folsom High School (FCUSD 2008b:A-1).

As shown on the FCUSD school attendance boundaries map, students living in the SPA would attend Russell Ranch Elementary School, Folsom Middle School, and Vista del Lago High School. Table 3A.14-1 identifies the 2007–2008 school-year enrollments for these schools.

Table 3A.14-1
Folsom Cordova Unified School District Enrollment, 2008–2009

School Name	Grade	Current Enrollment	State Standard Capacity	Estimated Remaining Capacity
Russell Ranch Elementary School	K–5	428	529	101
Folsom Middle School	6–8	1,248	1,220	-28
Vista del Lago High School [1]	9–12	955	1,497	542

Note: Student enrollment in the district changes daily as more students enroll and others leave; therefore, Table 3A.14-1 does not necessarily reflect exact current enrollment.

[1] For the 2008–2009 school year, the Vista del Lago High School is open to freshman, sophomores, and juniors.

Source: California Department of Education 2009, FCUSD 2008b

Russell Ranch Elementary School located at 375 Dry Creek Road, approximately 5.7 miles northeast of the SPA, is the newest elementary school in the FCUSD and currently serves elementary school students in grades K–5. The buildings were completed and occupied in August 2007, and include 25 permanent classrooms, a library, a multipurpose room, an administrative building, and one permanent portable to house the Student Care Program. (FCUSD 2008b:B-22.)

Folsom Middle School is located at 500 Blue Ravine Road, approximately 4.5 miles north of the SPA, and serves students in grades 6-8. Folsom Middle School includes 34 classrooms, library, multipurpose room, gymnasium, and an administrative building. (FCUSD 2008b:B-28.)

Vista del Lago High School is located at 1655 Iron Point Road, approximately 2.0 miles north of the SPA. The high school serves students in grades 9–12. The first phase of construction opened for the 2007–2008 school year serving freshmen and sophomores. The second phase of construction, along with the joint use library, opened for the 2008–2009 school year and Vista del Lago High School currently serves freshman, sophomores, and juniors. When completed, the campus will include an administration building, gymnasium, learning resource center, multipurpose building, joint use library, 56 permanent classrooms, and temporary relocatable classrooms. (FCUSD 2008b:B-41.)

School Facilities Improvement District 3—South of U.S. Highway 50/East of Sunrise Boulevard

FCUSD has planned for development of the SPA in its *Folsom Cordova Unified School District Revised Facility Needs Assessment* (2008a) and *FCUSD Facility Master Plan* (2008b). The SPA is within the School Facilities Improvement District (SFID) 3, which encompasses portions of Rancho Cordova and Folsom in the area south of U.S. 50, east of Sunrise Boulevard, north of Douglas Road, and east to the El Dorado County line. Within this area, planning has begun for large-scale residential developments, including the Proposed Project, Rio del Oro, Westborough, Easton, Glenborough, and North Douglas.

Based on information from the City of Folsom Planning Department, the City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department, the Sacramento County Planning Department, and local developers, it is estimated that SFID 3 will eventually contain over 32,327 new residential units: 20,603 single-family units, 6,073 multifamily medium-density units, and 6,154 high density multifamily units (FCUSD 2008b:E-5). These residential developments are expected to generate 18,005 new students and require development of 16 elementary schools, 4 middle schools, and 2 high schools over the next 25 years (FCUSD 2008b:D-18). Of this total, the FCUSD estimates that

development of the Proposed Project Alternative would generate 5,823 students and require five elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school over the next 17 years (FCUSD 2008b:D-17).

FCUSD prepared an updated facility master plan in October 2008 for the SFID 3 area to provide updated enrollment, capacity, student generation rates, and expected buildout totals anticipated to be generated by new residential development. A student-yield generation rate study was conducted as part of the master planning process. The yield-rate study included a survey of new (built within the last 1–5 years) single-family and multi-family residential units. The current student-yield generation rates for SFID 3, which is used in this analysis to calculate the estimated number of students generated by the Proposed Project and alternatives under consideration, are provided in Table 3A.14-2, below.

Table 3A.14-2
Student-Yield Generation Rates for the Folsom Cordova Unified School District

Grade Level	Single Family (Students per Dwelling Unit)	Multifamily Medium Density (Students per Dwelling Unit)	Multifamily (Students per Dwelling Unit)
Elementary (K–5)	0.42	0.20	0.07
Middle (6–8)	0.14	0.08	0.04
High (9–12)	0.16	0.07	0.04
Special Day Classrooms (K–12) [1]	0.01	0.01	0.01
Total	**0.72**	**0.36**	**0.16**

Notes:
[1] Special education students were evenly weighted by grade group and included in the corresponding grade group for the calculation of the number of schools required.
Source: FCUSD 2008b:D-16

The FCUSD is funded by 50% state and 50% local sources. The district can receive local funding through developer impact fees, tax revenue from Mello-Roos districts, and General Obligation (GO) bonds. Developer impact fees are the major source of funding for the district. Based on its facility needs assessment, FCUSD demonstrated the need to levy Level II developer fees (described below in Section 3A.14.2, "Regulatory Framework") in the SFID 3 that are higher than the statutory fee. As of August 2008, Level II fees for residential development are $6.99 per square foot and $0.47 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction (FCUSD 2008a:22, 2009). Developer fees may be used to finance new schools and equipment, and to reconstruct existing facilities to maintain adequate housing for all the district's students. Mello-Roos districts are defined tax areas usually associated with new residential subdivisions, which are often used for additional school taxes.

In April 2007, voters passed Measure M, a $750 million school-facilities GO bond. Measure M will fund the construction of elementary, middle, and high school facilities, a district education services center, and maintenance facilities. The FCUSD is currently in the master planning stage for Rio del Oro Elementary #1 and in the schematic design phase for Mather High/Morrison Creek Middle Schools. The estimated completion date for the elementary and high/middle school is currently 2015. The District has preliminary site approval for both sites from the California Department of Education (CDE). (FCUSD 2008b:D-14.)

Measure W, passed by Folsom voters in 2004, amended the Folsom City Charter to require the funding and construction of all necessary school facilities in the SPA by new development so that Folsom residents north of U.S. 50 are not required to pay for the construction of new school facilities serving the SPA and existing schools are not overcrowded by development of the Proposed Project Alternative.

3A.14.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

FEDERAL PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS

There are no Federal plans, policies, regulations, or laws related to public services that apply to the Proposed Project or alternatives under consideration.

STATE PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS

California Occupational Safety and Health Administration

In accordance with California Code of Regulations Title 8 Sections 1270 "Fire Prevention" and 6773 "Fire Protection and Fire Equipment," the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration has established minimum standards for fire suppression and emergency medical services. The standards include, but are not limited to, guidelines on the handling of highly combustible materials; fire hose sizing requirements; restrictions on the use of compressed air; access roads; and the testing, maintenance, and use of all fire fighting and emergency medical equipment.

Fire Codes and Guidelines

The California Fire Code contains regulations relating to construction, maintenance, and use of buildings. Topics addressed in the code include fire department access, fire hydrants, automatic sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems, fire and explosion hazards safety, hazardous materials storage and use, provisions intended to protect and assist fire responders, industrial processes, and many other general and specialized fire-safety requirements for new and existing buildings and the surrounding premises. The California Fire Code contains specialized technical regulations related to fire and life safety.

All development projects in Folsom are required to meet various other fire protection requirements identified in the Folsom Fire Code (City of Folsom Municipal Code Title 8, Chapter 8.36). The fire code requires that automatic fire sprinklers be installed in all new commercial construction that exceeds 3,600 square feet and some residential properties exceeding 4,999 square feet. The fire code outlines the number and distribution of fire hydrants and minimum fire-flow requirements for structures exceeding 3,600 square feet. The City of Folsom Fire Department requirements are determined for specific development projects at the design stage.

An important requirement for fire suppression is adequate fire flow, which is the amount of water, expressed in gallons per minute (gpm), available to control a given fire and the length of time that this flow is available. The availability of sufficient water flows and pressure is a basic requirement of the California Building Code. The total fire flow needed to extinguish a structural fire is based on a variety of factors, including building design, internal square footage, construction materials, dominant use, height, number of floors, and distance to adjacent buildings. Minimum requirements for available water flow at a given building are dependent on standards set in the California Fire Code.

State School Funding

California Education Code Section 17620 authorizes school districts to levy a fee, charge, dedication, or other requirement against any development project for the construction or reconstruction of school facilities, provided that the district can show justification for levying the fees. California Government Code Section 65995 limits the fee to be collected to the statutory fee unless a school district conducts a Facility Needs Assessment (Government Code Section 65995.6) and meets certain conditions.

Senate Bill 50 (Chapter 407, Statutes of 1998) instituted a new school facility program by which school districts can apply for state construction and modernization funds. This legislation limits the power of cities and counties

to require developers to mitigate impacts on school facilities as a condition of approving new development. This legislation also provides the authority for school districts to levy fees at three different levels:

- Level I fees are the current statutory fees allowed under Education Code Section 17620. As mentioned above, this code section authorizes school districts to levy a fee against residential and commercial developers to fund school construction or reconstruction. These fees are adjusted in January every 2 years in accordance with the statewide cost index for Class B construction as determined by the State Allocation Board.

- Level II developer fees are outlined in California Government Code Section 65995.5. This code section allows a school district to impose a higher fee on residential construction if certain conditions are met. These conditions include having a substantial percentage of students on multitrack year-round scheduling, having an assumed debt equal to 15–30% of the district's bonding capacity (the percentage is based on revenue sources for repayment), having at least 20% of the district's teaching stations housed in relocatable classrooms, and having placed (within the last 4 years) a local bond measure on the ballot that received at least 50% plus one of the votes cast. A Facility Needs Assessment must demonstrate that the need for new school facilities for unhoused pupils is attributable to projected enrollment growth from the construction of new residential units over the next five years. As of August 2008, Level II fees are $6.99 per square foot for residential development and $0.47 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction (FCUSD 2009).

- Level III developer fees are outlined in California Government Code Section 655995.7. This code section authorizes a school district that has been approved to collect Level II fees to collect a higher fee on residential construction if state funding becomes unavailable. This fee is equal to twice the amount of Level II fees. However, if a district eventually receives state funding, this excess fee may be reimbursed to the developers or subtracted from the amount of state funding.

California Department of Education

The CDE School Facilities Planning Division (SFPD) has prepared the *School Site Analysis and Development*. This guide was changed by CDE in 2000 to reflect various changes in educational conditions, such as lowering of class sizes and use of advanced technology. The guide provides specific recommendations for school size and school site selection criteria for locating appropriate school sites in the State of California. This document suggests a ratio of 1:2 between buildings and land. CDE is aware that in a number of cases, primarily in urban settings, smaller sites cannot accommodate this ratio. In such cases, SFPD may approve an amount of acreage less than the recommended gross site size and building-to-grounds ratio. The expanded use of school buildings and grounds for community and agency joint use also influenced the modification of the CDE recommendations, as did concern for the safety of students and staff members.

Certain health and safety requirements for school site selection are governed by state regulations and SFPD policies. These requirements are outlined in the *School Site Selection and Approval Guide* and relate to:

- proximity to airports, high-voltage power transmission lines, railroads, and major roadways;

- presence of toxic and hazardous substances;

- hazardous facilities and hazardous air emissions within one-quarter mile;

- proximity to high-pressure natural-gas lines, propane storage facilities, gasoline lines, pressurized sewer lines, or high-pressure water pipelines;

- noise;

- results of geological studies or soil analyses;

- traffic and school bus safety; and
- safety issues related to joint-use facilities.

The public services analysis for this EIR/EIS is being conducted at a programmatic level only. Therefore, an analysis of conformity of the proposed school sites with the CDE School Siting Criteria is not part of this program-level analysis and would be the subject of further, separate project-level environmental review.

REGIONAL AND LOCAL PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS

Sacramento County General Plan

There are no goals and policies of the Sacramento County General Plan (1993) that are applicable to the Proposed Project or alternatives under consideration.

El Dorado County General Plan

There are no goals and policies of the El Dorado County General Plan (2004) that are applicable to the Proposed Project or alternatives under consideration.

City of Folsom General Plan

The following goals and policies of the City of Folsom General Plan (1988) are applicable to the Proposed Project and the other four action alternatives. There are no City of Folsom goals and policies that are applicable to the No Project Alternative.

Land Use Element

GOAL 16: To allow for public and quasi-public land uses meeting the governmental service, education, cultural, recreational, and religious needs of Folsom residents.

- **Policy 16.1:** Fire and police department substations shall be planned and located so that a maximum response time goals as set by the City Council can be maintained.

Safety Element

GOAL 29: To protect lives and property from unacceptable risks resulting from natural and manmade hazards.

- **Policy 29.1:** Fire and police department personnel/resident population ratios shall be maintained at adequate levels as defined by the City Council.

Public Facilities Element

GOAL 40: To set targets for ultimate build-out of the City, to plan for the provision of public facilities and services to meet this level of development, and to phase development according to the capacity of public facilities and services to meet those targets.

- **Policy 40.1:** No permit for construction shall be issued for any new development not served by existing municipal facilities until the following conditions have been met:

    1. The applicant can provide for the installation and/or financing (through fees or other means) of needed public facilities.

    2. The project is included in the area covered by an existing facilities plan approved by the City.

3. The project can be served by on-site or private facilities meeting City and County health and safety requirements.

- **Policy 40.2:** The City shall require the preparation of a facilities plan for an identified area when:

1. Development of an area necessitates the provision, extension, and/or expansion of municipal services and facilities which are not customarily constructed by a developer, or

2. There is a need for services or facilities not otherwise funded by regular City fees, or

3. The construction of the necessary services and facilities cannot be logically or economically provided by one landowner/development in the normal sequence of orderly development.

- **Policy 40.3:** An area facilities plan shall include, but not be limited to the following:

1. Description of the plan area, the basis for the selection of the proposed boundaries, and the development potential of the area which is based on a comprehensive land use map.

2. A statement of the plan's consistency with the Folsom General plan and the City's Urban Development Policy.

3. Identification of the nature and extent of facilities necessary to serve the area and a schedule of estimated time within which facilities must be constructed.

4. Engineer's estimate of the total cost of such improvements (including plan preparation).

5. A plan for the equitable apportionment of costs among benefited properties and adjustments thereof based on the time such costs are paid.

6. The nature of the obligation of each land-owner or developer.

7. Discussion of the options available to finance the improvements including, but not limited to, construction by developers.

8. Provisions for amendments to the plan which may result from changes in the plan area, development patterns, etc.

9. Provisions to refund or reimburse landowners who construct facilities with capacity beyond the ultimate need of their developments.

10. A statement which recognizes that the financial commitments required pursuant to such plans are not in lieu of other municipal service and facilities fees. The financial commitments of landowners/developers shall be taken into account by the City in determining the extent of the imposition of such other municipal service and facilities fees.

11. A statement which recognizes that the area facilities plan is not intended to be responsible for the provision of all possible public facilities that will be needed in the future and that there are or may be additional costs/fees established by the City and other jurisdictions (such a school district) that may apply to the area. However, the plan must address the need for public facilities which may reasonably be assumed to be necessary during buildout of the area.

12. Provisions for administration of the area plan and the collection and distribution of funds.

3A.14.3 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures

Thresholds of Significance

The thresholds for determining the significance of impacts for this analysis are based on the environmental checklist in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. These thresholds also encompass the factors taken into account under NEPA to determine the significance of an action in terms of its context and the intensity of its impacts. The Proposed Project or alternatives under consideration were determined to result in a significant impact related to public services if they would do any of the following:

- create a need for the development of new service facilities (e.g., fire, police, schools, and other public facilities, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts;
- create circumstances where existing services and facilities could not meet established performance standards (i.e., response times, provider-per-resident ratios); or
- substantially impede existing services.

Analysis Methodology

Impacts on fire services, police services, and public schools that would result from project implementation were identified by comparing existing service capacity and facilities against future demand associated with project implementation. Evaluation of potential public-services impacts was based on a review of documents pertaining to the SPA and vicinity, including the City of Folsom General Plan (1988), the *Folsom Cordova Unified School District Revised Facility Needs Assessment* (2008a), and the *FCUSD Facility Master Plan* (2008b). Additional background information on current services, staffing, and equipment was obtained through consultation with appropriate agencies, including the City of Folsom Fire Department and FCUSD.

The project proposes to construct three fire stations, one police service center, five elementary schools, and one combined middle school and high school at different locations within the SPA. The number of new firefighters and police officers were calculated based the population projections for the project alternatives and the City's ratio of 1.6 fire personnel to 1,000 residents and 1.3 police officers per 1,000 residents. Table 3A.14-3 shows the number of new firefighters and police officers that would be required to serve the project under each action alternative. The No Project Alternative would not require new firefighters or police officers because the 44 rural residences would be served by existing firefighting/law enforcement capacity within Sacramento County.

Table 3A.14-3
Folsom South of U.S. 50 Specific Plan Firefighter and Police Officer Projections

Action Alternative	Number of Required Firefighters[1]	Number of Required Police Officers[2]
Proposed Project	39	32
Resource Impact Minimization	31	25
Centralized Development	33	27
Reduced Hillside Development	40	33
No USACE Permit	25	21

Notes:
[1] The number of required firefighters is based on the population projected for each action alternative and the City of Folsom Fire Department's ratio of 1.6 firefights per 1,000 residents.
[2] The number of required police officers is on the population projected for each action alternative and the City of Folsom Police Department's ratio of 1.3 police officers per 1,000 residents.
Source: Data compiled by AECOM in 2010

The number of new elementary, middle, and high school students were calculated based on the student-yield generation rates shown in Table 3A.14-2. Special education students are calculated by the FCUSD using an evenly weighted student-yield generation factor regardless of grade level and dwelling unit type. These students are considered to be evenly distributed throughout all grades levels (K-12). It can not be determined how these students would be ultimately distributed by grade level and it is assumed that the proposed project and action alternatives would generate slightly more students than analyzed below. However, special education students have been considered in the number of schools required to serve the proposed project and action alternatives. The number of new students generated under each action alternative is summarized below in Table 3A.14-4. The up to 44 rural residences that could be constructed under the No Project Alternative would not generate substantial new students.

Table 3A.14-4
Folsom South of U.S. 50 Specific Plan Elementary, Middle, and High School Student Projections

Action Alternative	Number of Elementary School Students[1]	Number of Middle School Students[2]	Number of High School Students[3]	Number of Special Education Students (K-12) [4, 5]	Total Number of Students (K-12) [6]
Proposed Project	2,807	1,017	1,073	102	4,999
Resource Impact Minimization	2,996	866	919	80	3,076
Centralized Development	2,363	864	889	90	2,453
Reduced Hillside Development	2,556	1,480	972	116	2,672
No USACE Permit	2,005	710	756	64	2,069

Notes:

[1] The number of elementary school students was calculated based on the sum of the dwelling units under the Single Family and Single Family High Density land use designation multiplied by the FCUSD's student-yield generation rate shown in Table 3A.14-2.

[2] The number of middle school students was calculated based on the sum of the dwelling units under the Multi-Family Low Density and Multi-Family Medium Density land use designations multiplied by the FCUSD's student-yield generation rate shown in Table 3A.14-2.

[3] The number of high school students was calculated based on the sum of the dwelling units under the Multi-Family High Density and Mixed-Use land use designations multiplied by the FCUSD's student-yield generation rate shown in Table 3A.14-2.

[4] The number of special education students was calculated based on the total number of dwelling units multiplied by the FCUSD's student-yield generation rate shown in Table 3A.14-2.

[5] Special education students were evenly weighted by grade group and included in the corresponding grade group for the calculation of the number of schools required.

[6] It can not be determined how these special education students would be ultimately distributed by grade level. However, the total number of special education students has been considered in the number of schools required to serve the proposed project and action alternatives.

Source: Data compiled by AECOM in 2010

It is anticipated that the provision of all new or physically altered public service facilities intended to meet the increased demand for public services would occur on site. Because public facilities would be constructed as part of the Proposed Project Alternative and would be confined to the SPA, this EIR/EIS already anticipates and addresses the physical environmental impacts associated with construction and operation of these facilities (along with development of the project in general) in other sections of the EIR/EIS (e.g., Section 3A.4, "Air Quality - Land," Section 3A.4, "Biological Resources - Land"). Therefore, these indirect, physical impacts are not addressed in this section.

The Sacramento Country Day School had originally proposed construction of a new campus on an approximately 80-acre property in the southeast portion of the SPA along White Rock Road. The Sacramento Country Day

School would be privately owned and would serve pre-kindergarten through grade 12 students throughout Sacramento County. Because the Sacramento Country Day School would be a privately owned facility, it would not be subject to the CDE school facilities planning criteria and would not be required to pay state-mandated school impact fees. Recently, the Sacramento Country Day School withdrew its application to construct a campus in the SPA. For purposes of this EIR/EIS, some type of school facility would still be constructed on this site; however, because it not known what type of facility (public or private) or how many students could be accommodated, it not possible to perform any analysis related to school facilities on this property.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

Impacts that would occur under each alternative development scenario are identified as follows: NP (No Project), NCP (No USACE Permit), PP (Proposed Project/Action), RIM (Resource Impact Minimization), CD (Centralized Development), and RHD (Reduced Hillside Development) (for information on project phasing, please refer to Section 2.3.1 in Chapter 2, "Alternatives"). The impacts for each alternative are compared relative to the PP at the end of each impact conclusion (i.e., similar, greater, lesser).

IMPACT 3A.14-1 Temporary Reduction in Emergency Response Services during Construction. *Project implementation could obstruct roadways in the project vicinity during construction, potentially obstructing or slowing emergency vehicles attempting to access the area.*

On-Site and Off-Site Elements

NP

Under the No Project Alternative, development of up to 44 rural residences could be constructed under the existing Sacramento County agricultural zoning classification AG-80, and no off-site water facilities would be constructed. All or a portion of these dwelling units could be constructed by individual property owners over the project's 19-year buildout period (2011–2030). Development of individual dwelling units would require minimal, temporary, short-term construction activities; therefore, roadways would not be obstructed and emergency response times would be unaffected during construction under the No Project Alternative. This impact would be **direct** and **less than significant**. **No indirect** impacts would occur. ***[Lesser]***

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD,

Implementation of the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Density Alternatives would include construction activities of varying levels over a 19-year period (approximately 2011 through 2030). Most of the project-related construction activities would occur on site; however, the project involves a variety of off-site U.S. 50 interchange improvements and construction of the sewer force main and detention basin in Sacramento County and two roadway connections in El Dorado County. Nearby roadways in the vicinity of the SPA and off-site areas, such as White Rock Road, Prairie City Road, and U.S. 50, would likely be affected intermittently during construction activities (see Section 3A.15, "Traffic and Transportation - Land"). Ongoing construction activities could result in temporary lane closures, increased truck traffic, and other roadway effects that could slow or stop emergency vehicles, temporarily increasing response times and impeding existing services. Potential reduction of emergency response services during construction would be a **direct, significant** impact. **No indirect** impacts would occur. ***[Similar]***

Mitigation Measure 3A.14-1: Prepare and Implement a Construction Traffic Control Plan.

The project applicant(s) of all project phases shall prepare and implement traffic control plans for construction activities that may affect road rights-of-way. The traffic control plans must follow any applicable standards of the agency responsible for the affected roadway and must be approved and signed

by a professional engineer. Measures typically used in traffic control plans include advertising of planned lane closures, warning signage, a flagperson to direct traffic flows when needed, and methods to ensure continued access by emergency vehicles. During project construction, access to existing land uses shall be maintained at all times, with detours used as necessary during road closures. Traffic control plans shall be submitted to the appropriate City or County department or the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for review and approval before the approval of all project plans or permits, for all project phases where implementation may cause impacts on traffic.

Mitigation for the off-site elements outside of the City of Folsom's jurisdictional boundaries must be coordinated by the project applicant(s) of each applicable project phase with the affected oversight agency(ies) (i.e., El Dorado and/or Sacramento Counties and Caltrans).

Implementation: Project applicant(s) of all project phases.

Timing: Before the approval of all relevant plans and/or permits and during construction of all project phases.

Enforcement:

1. For those roadways that would be annexed into the City of Folsom: City of Folsom Public Works Department.
2. For those roadways that would remain under the control of Sacramento County: Sacramento County Department of Transportation.
3. For the two off-site roadway connections into El Dorado Hills: El Dorado County Department of Transportation.
4. For U.S. 50 interchange improvements: Caltrans.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.14-1 would reduce significant impacts associated with decreased emergency response times during construction under the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development Alternatives to a **less-than-significant** level by requiring preparation and implementation of a construction traffic control plan that would provide for adequate emergency access during construction activities. However, some of the off-site elements (two roadway connections in El Dorado County, detention basin in Sacramento County, and off-site interchange improvements on U.S. 50) fall under the jurisdiction of El Dorado and Sacramento Counties and Caltrans; therefore, neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over their timing or implementation. The impacts could be reduced to a less-than-significant level if El Dorado and Sacramento Counties and Caltrans cooperate in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT 3A.14-2 Increased Demand for Fire Protection Facilities, Systems, Equipment, and Services. *Project development would result in increased demand for fire protection facilities and services, potentially resulting in the need for additional staff and equipment to maintain an adequate level of service.*

On-Site Elements

NP

The No Project Alternative could develop of up to 44 rural residences and generate approximately 128 new residents under the existing Sacramento County agricultural zoning classification AG-80, and no off-site water facilities would be constructed. Increased demands for fire protection services would be minimal under the No Project Alternative and new residential units would not require additional fire protection services beyond what is

currently available. Therefore, impacts on fire protection facilities and services would be **direct** and **less than significant**. **No indirect** impacts would occur. ***[Lesser]***

NCP

Under the No USACE Permit Alternative, the estimated residential population at project buildout would be 15,808 persons. To maintain adequate levels of service, additional fire personnel, facilities, and equipment would be required to serve project development at buildout. Using the City's ratio of 1.6 fire personnel to 1,000 residents, a minimum of 25 new firefighters would be needed to serve project development at buildout. This would be approximately 14 fewer new firefighters than would be required under the Proposed Project Alternative.

The No USACE Permit Alternative would include construction of fire stations to serve the SPA. The location, number of personnel, and equipment required at new fire stations has not been determined. Final size and location of the fire station sites would be determined on completion of response time analysis studies and through coordination with the City of Folsom Fire Department.

Per the City of Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 3, Title 3.80, "Capital Improvement New Construction Fee," new development is responsible for the full cost of additional facilities and equipment necessary as a result of that development through payment of the City's capital improvement new construction fees. This fee is used exclusively for construction of new fire and police stations and associated apparatus as required by new development. In addition, new development within the EDHFD service area would be required to pay $1.16 per square foot of residential and commercial development, which is used exclusively for construction of new fire stations and associated apparatus.

Because the City of Folsom Fire Department and EDHFD outlines fire prevention standards to be incorporated into new residential and commercial development and these standards require approval by the City of Folsom Fire Department, the City of Folsom Community Department, and EDHFD for those areas of the SPA within the EDHFD service area, impacts on fire protection facilities and services would be **direct** and **potentially significant**. However, these impacts would be less than under the Proposed Project Alternative because fewer new firefighters would be required. The **indirect** physical impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. ***[Lesser]***

> Mitigation Measure 3A.14-2: Incorporate California Fire Code; City of Folsom Fire Code Requirements; and EDHFD Requirements, if Necessary, into Project Design and Submit Project Design to the City of Folsom Fire Department for Review and Approval.
>
> To reduce impacts related to the provision of new fire services, the project applicant(s) of all project phases shall do the following, as described below.
>
> 1. Incorporate into project designs fire flow requirements based on the California Fire Code, Folsom Fire Code (City of Folsom Municipal Code Title 8, Chapter 8.36), and other applicable requirements based on the City of Folsom Fire Department fire prevention standards. Improvement plans showing the incorporation automatic sprinkler systems, the availability of adequate fire flow, and the locations of hydrants shall be submitted to the City of Folsom Fire Department for review and approval. In addition, approved plans showing access design shall be provided to the City of Folsom Fire Department as described by Zoning Code Section 17.57.080 ("Vehicular Access Requirements"). These plans shall describe access-road length, dimensions, and finished surfaces for firefighting equipment. The installation of security gates across a fire apparatus access road shall be approved by the City of Folsom Fire Department. The design and operation of gates and barricades shall be in accordance with the Sacramento County Emergency Access Gates and Barriers Standard, as required by the City of Folsom Fire Code.

2. Submit a Fire Systems New Buildings, Additions, and Alterations Document Submittal List to the City of Folsom Community Development Department Building Division for review and approval before the issuance of building permits.

In addition to the above measures, the project applicant(s) of all project phases shall incorporate the provisions described below for the portion of the SPA within the EDHFD service area, if it is determined through City/El Dorado County negotiations that EDHFD would serve the 178-acre portion of the SPA.

3. Incorporate into project designs applicable requirements based on the EDHFD fire prevention standards. For commercial development, improvement plans showing roadways, land splits, buildings, fire sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems, and other commercial building improvements shall be submitted to the EDHFD for review and approval. For residential development, improvement plans showing property lines and adjacent streets or roads; total acreage or square footage of the parcel; the footprint of all structures; driveway plan views describing width, length, turnouts, turnarounds, radiuses, and surfaces; and driveway profile views showing the percent grade from the access road to the structure and vertical clearance shall be submitted to the EDHFD for review and approval.

4. Submit a Fire Prevention Plan Checklist to the EDHFD for review and approval before the issuance of building permits. In addition, residential development requiring automation fire sprinklers shall submit sprinkler design sheet(s) and hydraulic calculations from a California State Licensed C-16 Contractor.

The City shall not authorize the occupancy of any structures until the project applicant(s) have obtained a Certificate of Occupancy from the City of Folsom Community Development Department verifying that all fire prevention items have been addressed on-site to the satisfaction of the City of Folsom Fire Department and/or the EDHFD for the 178-acre area of the SPA within the EDHFD service area.

Implementation: Project applicant(s) of all project phases.

Timing: Before issuance of building permits and issuance of occupancy permits or final inspections for all project phases.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Fire Department, and City of Folsom Community Development Department, and/or EDHFD for the portion of the SPA within the EDHFD service area.

PP

Upon annexation of the SPA, fire protection services within the SMFD service area would become the responsibility of the City of Folsom Fire Department. During initial project development, Station 37 at 70 Clarksville Road would provide first-response service. This station is approximately 1.6 miles north of the SPA via Scott Road.

The EDHFD serves approximately 178 acres of the northeaster portion of the SPA as a multi-jurisdictional district. Currently, ongoing revenue neutrality negations between the EDHFD and the City will determine if this portion of the SPA remains in the EDHFD service area or is transferred to the jurisdiction of the City of Folsom Fire Department; therefore, it is assumed that this portion of the SPA would remain in the EDHFD service area. First-response service to the SPA within the EDHFD would be provided by Station 85 at 1050 Wilson Boulevard, approximately 1.2 miles northeast of the SPA via Latrobe Road in unincorporated El Dorado County.

The estimated population of the project under buildout of the Proposed Project Alternative would be 24,335 persons. To maintain adequate levels of service, additional fire personnel, facilities, and equipment would be

required to serve project development at buildout. Using the City's ratio of 1.6 fire personnel to 1,000 residents, a minimum of 39 new firefighters would be needed to serve the Proposed Project Alternative at buildout.

The Proposed Project Alternative would include construction of two fire stations to serve the SPA (see Exhibit 2-3, "Folsom South of 50 Conceptual Land Use Plan," in Chapter 2, "Alternatives"). The first fire station would be east of Oak Avenue and north of "A" Street and would house an engine company with three personnel on each of three shifts (Haverty, pers. comm., 2009). The second fire station would be north of "B" Street and east of Scott Road. The number of personnel and equipment required at this fire station has not been determined. Final size and location of the two fire station sites would be determined on completion of response time analysis studies and through coordination with the City of Folsom Fire Department.

Per the City of Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 3, Title 3.80, "Capital Improvement New Construction Fee," new development is responsible for the full cost of additional facilities and equipment necessary as a result of that development through payment of the City's capital improvement new construction fees. This fee is used exclusively for construction of new fire and police stations and associated apparatus as required by new development. In addition, new development within the EDHFD service area would be required to pay $1.16 per square foot of residential and commercial development, which is used exclusively for construction of new fire stations and associated apparatus (El Dorado County Fire Prevention Officers 2009).

The project applicant(s) would be required to incorporate California Fire Code and Folsom Fire Code (City of Folsom Municipal Code Title 8, Chapter 8.36) requirements into all development phases, including adequate on-site circulation, equipment access during emergency conditions, adequate firefighting water flow, hydrant spacing. In addition, the Folsom Fire Code requires that automatic fire sprinklers be installed in all new commercial construction that exceeds 3,600 square feet and some residential properties exceeding 4,999 square feet. The City of Folsom Community Development Building Division requires all new development to submit a Fire Systems New Buildings, Additions, and Alterations Document Submittal List documenting the incorporation of fire code requirements before issuance of building permits.

For those areas of the SPA within the EDHFD service area, the project applicant(s) would be required to incorporate EDHFD requirements into all development phases in addition to the requirements outlined in the California Fire Code and Folsom Fire Code. The EDHFD has adopted the El Dorado County Regional Fire Protection Standards and these standards include adequate on-site circulation, equipment access during emergency conditions, adequate firefighting water flow, and automatic fire sprinklers be installed in two-family residential dwelling units and extended to attached garages and basements. The EDHFD requires all new development to submit a Fire Prevention Plan Checklist documenting fire code requirements before issuance of building permits.

Because the City of Folsom Fire Department and EDHFD outlines fire prevention standards to be incorporated into new residential and commercial development and these standards require approval by City of Folsom Fire Department, City of Folsom Community Development Department and EDHFD for those areas of the SPA within the EDHFD service area, impacts on fire protection facilities and services would be **direct** and **potentially significant**. The **indirect** physical impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development.

Mitigation Measure: Implement Mitigation Measure 3A.14-2.

RIM

Under the Resource Impact Minimization Alternative, the estimated residential population at project buildout would be 19,584 persons. To maintain adequate levels of service, additional fire personnel, facilities, and equipment would be required to serve project development at buildout. Using the City's ratio of 1.6 fire personnel to 1,000 residents, a minimum of 31 new firefighters would be needed to serve project development at buildout.

This would be approximately 8 fewer new firefighters than would be required under the Proposed Project Alternative.

The Resource Minimization Alternative would include construction of fire stations to serve the SPA. The location, number of personnel, and equipment required at new fire stations has not been determined. Final size and location of the fire station sites would be determined on completion of response time analysis studies and through coordination with the City of Folsom Fire Department.

Per the City of Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 3, Title 3.80, "Capital Improvement New Construction Fee," new development is responsible for the full cost of additional facilities and equipment necessary as a result of that development through payment of the City's capital improvement new construction fees. This fee is used exclusively for construction of new fire and police stations and associated apparatus as required by new development. In addition, new development within the EDHFD service area would be required to pay $1.16 per square foot of residential and commercial development, which is used exclusively for construction of new fire stations and associated apparatus.

Because the City of Folsom Fire Department and EDHFD outlines fire prevention standards to be incorporated into new residential and commercial development and these standards require approval by the City of Folsom Fire Department, the City of Folsom Community Development Department, and EDHFD for those areas of the SPA within the EDHFD service area, impacts on fire protection facilities and services would be **direct** and **potentially significant**. However, these impacts would be less than under the Proposed Project Alternative because fewer new firefighters would be required. The **indirect** physical impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. ***[Lesser]***

Mitigation Measure: Implement Mitigation Measure 3A.14-2.

CD

Under the Centralized Development Alternative, the estimated residential population at project buildout would be 20,689 persons. To maintain adequate levels of service, additional fire personnel, facilities, and equipment would be required to serve project development at buildout. Using the City's ratio of 1.6 fire personnel to 1,000 residents, a minimum of 33 new firefighters would be needed to serve project development at buildout. This would be approximately six fewer new firefighters than would be required under the Proposed Project Alternative.

The Centralized Development Alternative would include construction of fire stations to serve the SPA. The location, number of personnel, and equipment required at new fire stations has not been determined. Final size and location of the fire station sites would be determined on completion of response time analysis studies and through coordination with the City of Folsom Fire Department.

Per the City of Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 3, Title 3.80, "Capital Improvement New Construction Fee," new development is responsible for the full cost of additional facilities and equipment necessary as a result of that development through payment of the City's capital improvement new construction fees. This fee is used exclusively for construction of new fire and police stations and associated apparatus as required by new development. In addition, new development within the EDHFD service area would be required to pay $1.16 per square foot of residential and commercial development, which is used exclusively for construction of new fire stations and associated apparatus.

Because the City of Folsom Fire Department and EDHFD outlines fire prevention standards to be incorporated into new residential and commercial development and these standards require approval by the City of Folsom Fire Department, the City of Folsom Community Development Department, and EDHFD for those areas of the SPA within the EDHFD service area, impacts on fire protection facilities and services would be **direct** and **potentially significant**. However, these impacts would be less than under the Proposed Project Alternative because fewer

new firefighters would be required. The **indirect** physical impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. ***[Lesser]***

Mitigation Measure: Implement Mitigation Measure 3A.14-2.

RHD

Under the Reduced Hillside Development Alternative, the estimated residential population at project buildout would be 28,084 persons. To maintain adequate levels of service, additional fire personnel, facilities, and equipment would be required to serve project development at buildout. Using the City's ratio of 1.6 fire personnel to 1,000 residents, a minimum of 40 new firefighters would be needed to serve project development at buildout. This would be approximately one more new firefighter than would be required under the Proposed Project Alternative.

The Reduced Hillside Development Alternative would include construction of fire stations to serve the SPA. The location, number of personnel, and equipment required at new fire stations has not been determined. Final size and location of the fire station sites would be determined on completion of response time analysis studies and through coordination with the City of Folsom Fire Department.

Per the City of Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 3, Title 3.80, "Capital Improvement New Construction Fee," new development is responsible for the full cost of additional facilities and equipment necessary as a result of that development through payment of the City's capital improvement new construction fees. This fee is used exclusively for construction of new fire and police stations and associated apparatus as required by new development. In addition, new development within the EDHFD service area would be required to pay $1.16 per square foot of residential and commercial development, which is used exclusively for construction of new fire stations and associated apparatus.

Because the City of Folsom Fire Department and EDHFD outlines fire prevention standards to be incorporated into new residential and commercial development and these standards require approval by the City of Folsom Fire Department, the City of Folsom Community Development Department, and EDHFD for those areas of the SPA within the EDHFD service area, impacts on fire protection facilities and services would be **direct** and **potentially significant**. However, these impacts would be greater than under the Proposed Project Alternative because more new firefighters would be required. The **indirect** physical impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. ***[Greater]***

Mitigation Measure: Implement Mitigation Measure 3A.14-2.

Off-Site Elements

Construction of the off-site freeway interchange improvements, the sewer force main, the drainage basin in Sacramento County, and the two roadway connections into El Dorado Hills would not involve construction of new housing or development of new businesses that would require firefighting services; therefore, the off-site elements would have **no direct** impact on the demand additional firefighting personnel, facilities, and equipment. **No indirect** impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.14-2 would reduce significant impacts under the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development Alternatives associated with the increased demand for fire protection facilities, systems, equipment, and services to a **less-than-significant** level by requiring that applicable California Fire Code, City of Folsom Fire Code, and/or EDHFD standards are incorporated into the project design, along with review and approval of project plans by the City of Folsom Fire Department, the City of Folsom Community Development Department Building

Division, and/or EDHFD for the 178-acre area of the SPA within the EDHFD service area prior to issuance of building permits.

IMPACT 3A.14-3 Increased Demand for Fire Flow. *Project implementation would include the development of residential, commercial, school, and other uses that would require adequate available water flow for fire suppression. Lack of adequate fire flow would impede effective fire suppression in the SPA.*

On-Site Elements

NP

Under the No Project Alternative, development of up to 44 rural residences could occur under the existing Sacramento County agricultural zoning classification AG-80, and no off-site water facilities would be constructed. There is currently no public water service available in the SPA, and property owners would be served by individual groundwater wells. Domestic groundwater wells would likely not be capable of pumping a sufficient amount of water to meet fire flow requirements. However, before issuance of a building permit from Sacramento County, the property owners would be required to coordinate with the SMFD regarding fire flow requirements and obtain a "Fire District Certificate of Release" (Sacramento County 2008). Therefore, increased demands for fire flow would be a **direct** and **less-than-significant** impact. **No indirect** impacts would occur. ***[Lesser]***

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

The City of Folsom Fire Department and EDHFD maintain oversight authority to ensure that adequate water volume and pressure are available their respective service areas. The total fire flow needed to extinguish a structural fire is based on a variety of factors, including building design, internal square footage, construction materials, dominant use, height, number of floors, and distance to adjacent buildings. Minimum requirements for available fire flow at a given building are dependent on standards set in the California Fire Code. Generally, fire flow requirements for the type of development associated with the Proposed Project Alternative are identified by the California Fire Code. These fire flow requirements are 1,500 gpm for low- and medium-density residential (2-hour duration), 2,500 gpm for high-density residential (3-hour duration), 3,000 gpm for commercial/office and light industrial (3-hour duration).

In addition to meeting minimum water flow requirements, all development projects in Folsom are required to meet various other fire protection requirements identified in the Folsom Fire Code. The fire code requires that automatic fire sprinklers be installed in all new commercial construction that exceeds 3,600 square feet and some residential properties exceeding 4,999 square feet. The fire code outlines the number and distribution of fire hydrants and minimum fire-flow requirements for structures exceeding 3,600 square feet. The City of Folsom Fire Department requirements are determined for specific development projects at the design stage. For the 178-acre area of the SPA within the EDHFD service area, all development projects are required to incorporate EDHFD requirements in addition to the requirements outlined in the California Fire Code and Folsom Fire Code. As discussed above, on-going revenue neutrality negations between the EDHFD and City would determine if the 178-acre portion of the SPA remains in the EDHFD service area or is transferred to the jurisdiction of the City of Folsom Fire Department.

Lack of adequate fire flow would impede the ability of the City of Folsom Fire Department and/or EDHFD to provide effective fire suppression service in the SPA. Increased demands for fire flow would be considered a **significant**, **direct** impact. **No indirect** impacts would occur. ***[Similar]***

Mitigation Measure: Implement Mitigation Measure 3A.14-2.

Mitigation Measure 3A.14-3: Incorporate Fire Flow Requirements into Project Designs.

The project applicant(s) of all project phases shall incorporate into their project designs fire flow requirements based on the California Fire Code, Folsom Fire Code, and/or EDHFD for those areas of the SPA within the EDHFD service area and shall verify to City of Folsom Fire Department that adequate water flow is available, prior to approval of improvement plans and issuance of occupancy permits or final inspections for all project phases.

Implementation: Project applicant(s) of all project phases.

Timing: Before issuance of building permits and issuance of occupancy permits or final inspections for all project phases.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Fire Department, City of Folsom Community Development Department, and/or EDHFD for the 178-acre portion of the SPA within the EDHFD service area.

Off-Site Elements

Construction of the off-site freeway interchange improvements, the sewer force main, the drainage basin in Sacramento County, and the roadway connections into El Dorado Hills would not involve construction of new housing or development of new businesses that would require provision of fire flow; therefore, the off-site elements would have **no direct** or **indirect** impacts on the demand for fire flow.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.14-2 and 3A.14-3 would reduce impacts associated with increased demand for fire flow to a **less-than-significant** level under the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development Alternatives because verification from the City of Folsom Fire Department and/or EDHFD that adequate water supply is available would be obtained prior to approval of improvement plans, and project fire flow would design would based on specification requirements included in the California Fire Code, the Folsom Fire Code, and/or the EDHFD for the portion of the SPA within the EDHFD service area and reviewed and approved by the City.

IMPACT 3A.14-4 Increased Demand for Police Protection Facilities, Services, and Equipment. *Project development would increase the demand for police protection facilities and services, resulting in the need for additional staff and equipment to maintain an adequate level of service.*

On-Site Elements

NP

The No Project Alternative could develop up to 44 rural residences and generate approximately 128 new residents under the existing Sacramento County agricultural zoning classification AG-80, and no off-site water facilities would be constructed. Increased demands for police protection services would be minimal under the No Project Alternative and new residential units would not require additional police protection services beyond what is currently available. Therefore, impacts on police protection services would be **direct** and **less than significant**. **No indirect** impacts would occur. ***[Lesser]***

NCP

To maintain adequate levels of service, additional officers, facilities, and equipment would be required to serve project development at buildout. Under the No USACE Permit Alternative, the estimated residential population at project buildout would be 15,808 persons. Using the City's ratio of 1.3 officers to 1,000 residents, a minimum of 21 new police officers would be needed to serve project development at buildout. This would be approximately 11 fewer new officers than would be required under the Proposed Project Alternative.

The No USACE Permit Alternative would include construction of one police service center north of Easton Valley Parkway west of Scott Road. The location, number of personnel, and equipment required at new police service center has not been determined. The final size and location of the police service center would be determined through coordination with the City of Folsom Police Department.

Per the City of Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 3, Title 3.80, "Capital Improvement New Construction Fee," new development is responsible for the full cost of additional facilities and equipment necessary as a result of that development through payment of the City's capital improvement new construction fees. This fee is used exclusively for construction of new fire and police stations and associated apparatus as required by new development.

Because the applicants would fund and construct sufficient police facilities to serve the Proposed Project Alternative, impacts related to increased demands for police protection facilities, services, and equipment would be **direct** and **less than significant**, and would occur to a lesser degree than under the Proposed Project Alternative because fewer new police officers would be required. The **indirect** impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. ***[Lesser]***

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

PP

The City of Folsom Police Department, which is located approximately 5 miles northeast of the SPA, would provide first-response service for the SPA. Under the Proposed Project Alternative, the estimated population of the project would be 24,335 persons at buildout. To maintain adequate levels of service, additional law enforcement facilities, services, and equipment would be required to serve project development at buildout. Using the City's ratio of 1.3 officers to 1,000 residents, a minimum of 32 new police officers would be needed to accommodate project development at buildout.

The Proposed Project Alternative would include construction of one police service center north of Easton Valley Parkway west of Scott Road (see Exhibit 2-3, "Folsom South of 50 Conceptual Land Use Plan," in Chapter 2, "Alternatives"). The final size and location of the police service center would be determined through coordination with the City of Folsom Police Department.

Per the City of Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 3, Title 3.80, "Capital Improvement New Construction Fee," new development is responsible for the full cost of additional facilities and equipment necessary as a result of that development through payment of the City's capital improvement new construction fees. This fee is used exclusively for construction of new fire and police stations and associated apparatus as required by new development.

Because the project applicant(s) would fund and construct sufficient police facilities and personnel to serve the Proposed Project Alternative, impacts related to increased demands for police protection facilities, services, and equipment would be **direct** and **less than significant**. The **indirect** impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

RIM

To maintain adequate levels of service, additional officers, facilities, and equipment would be required to serve project development at buildout. Under the Resource Impact Minimization Alternative, the estimated residential population at project buildout would be 19,584 persons. Using the City's ratio of 1.3 officers to 1,000 residents, a minimum of 25 new police officers would be needed to serve project development at buildout. This would be approximately seven fewer new officers than would be required under the Proposed Project Alternative.

The Resource Impact Minimization Alternative would include construction of one police service center. The location, number of personnel, and equipment required at new police service center has not been determined. The final size and location of the police service center would be determined through coordination with the City of Folsom Police Department.

Per the City of Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 3, Title 3.80, "Capital Improvement New Construction Fee," new development is responsible for the full cost of additional facilities and equipment necessary as a result of that development through payment of the City's capital improvement new construction fees. This fee is used exclusively for construction of new fire and police stations and associated apparatus as required by new development.

Because the applicants would fund and construct sufficient police facilities to serve the Proposed Project Alternative, impacts related to increased demands for police protection facilities, services, and equipment would be **direct** and **less than significant**, and would occur to a lesser degree than under the Proposed Project Alternative because fewer new police officers would be required. The **indirect** physical impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. ***[Lesser]***

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

CD

To maintain adequate levels of service, additional officers, facilities, and equipment would be required to serve project development at buildout. Under the Centralized Development Alternative, the estimated residential population at project buildout would be 20,689 persons. Using the City's ratio of 1.3 officers to 1,000 residents, a minimum of 27 new police officers would be needed to serve project development at buildout. This would be approximately five fewer new officers than would be required under the Proposed Project Alternative.

The Centralized Development Alternative would include construction of one police service center. The location, number of personnel, and equipment required at new police service center has not been determined. The final size and location of the police service center would be determined through coordination with the City of Folsom Police Department.

Per the City of Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 3, Title 3.80, "Capital Improvement New Construction Fee," new development is responsible for the full cost of additional facilities and equipment necessary as a result of that development through payment of the City's capital improvement new construction fees. This fee is used exclusively for construction of new fire and police stations and associated apparatus as required by new development.

Because the applicants would fund and construct sufficient police facilities to serve the Proposed Project Alternative, impacts related to increased demands for police protection facilities, services, and equipment would be **direct** and **less than significant**, and would occur to a lesser degree than under the Proposed Project

Alternative because fewer new police officers would be required. The **indirect** physical impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. ***[Lesser]***

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

RHD

To maintain adequate levels of service, additional officers, facilities, and equipment would be required to serve project development at buildout. Under the Reduced Hillside Development Alternative, the estimated residential population at project buildout would be 28,084 persons. Using the City's ratio of 1.3 officers to 1,000 residents, a minimum of 33 new police officers would be needed to serve project development at buildout. This would be approximately one more new officer than would be required under the Proposed Project Alternative.

The Reduced Hillside Development Alternative would include construction of one police service center. The location, number of personnel, and equipment required at new police service center has not been determined. The final size and location of the police service center would be determined through coordination with the City of Folsom Police Department.

Per the City of Folsom Municipal Code Chapter 3, Title 3.80, "Capital Improvement New Construction Fee," new development is responsible for the full cost of additional facilities and equipment necessary as a result of that development through payment of the City's capital improvement new construction fees. This fee is used exclusively for construction of new fire and police stations and associated apparatus as required by new development.

Because the applicants would fund and construct sufficient police facilities to serve the Proposed Project Alternative, impacts related to increased demands for police protection facilities, services, and equipment would be **direct** and **less than significant**, but would occur to a greater degree than under the Proposed Project Alternative because more new police officers would be required. The **indirect** physical impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. ***[Greater]***

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

Off-Site Elements

Construction of the off-site freeway interchange improvements, the sewer force main, the drainage basin in Sacramento County, and the two roadway connections into El Dorado Hills, would not involve construction of new housing or development of new businesses that would require police services; therefore, the off-site elements would have **no direct** impact on the demand additional law enforcement personnel, facilities, and equipment. **No indirect** impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

IMPACT 3A.14-5 Increased Demand for Public Elementary School Facilities and Services. *Project implementation would increase demand for elementary schools (grades K–5) to serve the project.*

On-Site Elements

NP

The No Project Alternative could include development of a maximum of 44 residential units and generate approximately 128 new residents in Sacramento County under the existing Sacramento County agricultural zoning classification AG-80, and no off-site water facilities would be constructed. Based on student-yield generation rates shown in Table 3A.14-2, the No Project Alternative would generate approximately 49 new elementary school students (grades K–5). Existing elementary schools in FCUSD would have sufficient capacity to accommodate these students. Therefore, impacts on elementary school facilities and services would be **direct** and **less than significant**. **No indirect** impacts would occur. ***[Lesser]***

NCP

Based on student-yield generation rates shown in Table 3A.14-2 above, implementation of the No USACE Permit Alternative would generate approximately 2,005 new elementary school students (grades K–5) at project buildout. This would be approximately 802 fewer elementary school students than under the Proposed Project Alternative. Once constructed, the five proposed elementary schools in the SPA would accommodate all 2,005 new students and would have capacity for an additional 995 students. Therefore, the proposed elementary schools would have sufficient capacity to meet the demands of project-generated elementary school students and would not result in a shortfall of elementary school services or facilities.

The project applicant(s) would pay the state-mandated school impact fees to FCUSD. This fee is typically an insufficient amount to fund 100% of new school facility construction and operation. The California Legislature has declared that the school impact fee is deemed to be full and adequate mitigation under CEQA. (California Government Code Section 65996.) In addition, Measure W would require the project applicant(s) to fund and construct sufficient elementary school facilities to serve the project. Therefore, implementation of the No USACE Permit Alternative would have a **less-than-significant**, **direct** impact on school services and facilities in the long term. The **indirect** impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. ***[Lesser]***

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

PP

The SPA would be within the boundaries of FCUSD. Based on student-yield generation rates shown in Table 3A.14-2, implementation of the Proposed Project Alternative would generate approximately 2,807 new elementary school students (grades K–5) at project buildout. The Proposed Project Alternative includes construction of five elementary schools throughout the SPA (see Exhibit 2-3, “Folsom South of 50 Conceptual Land Use Plan,” in Chapter 2, “Alternatives”).

Elementary schools in FCUSD have an average capacity of 600 students (FCUSD 2008a:18). Using this average as the assured capacity of schools to be built on-site, the five proposed school sites would have a total capacity of 3,000 students. Thus, once constructed, the proposed elementary schools would accommodate all 2,807 new students and would have capacity for an additional 193 students. To accommodate students in the SPA, school attendance boundaries would be adjusted regularly to account for the phases of development and available capacity at completed schools in the SPA. Therefore, the proposed elementary schools would have sufficient

capacity to meet the demands of project-generated elementary school students and would not result in a shortfall of school services or facilities.

As required by state law, the project applicant(s) would pay the state-mandated school impact fees to FCUSD. As of March 2008, the developer is charged Level II fees of $6.99 per square foot for residential development and $0.47 per square foot for commercial development in the FCUSD boundaries (FCUSD 2009). The City would determine the assessable square footage that would be subject to the fee at the time of development (FCUSD 2009). This fee is typically an insufficient amount to fund 100% of new school facility construction. The California Legislature has declared that the school impact fee is deemed to be full and adequate mitigation under CEQA. (California Government Code Section 65996.) In addition, Measure W would require the project applicant(s) to fund and construct sufficient elementary school facilities to serve the Proposed Project Alternative.

Because the project applicant(s) would pay state-mandated school impact fees and fund all costs associated with construction of middle and high school facilities, and assuming that the middle school/high school is constructed, implementation of the Proposed Project Alternative would have a **less-than-significant, direct** impact on school services in the long term. This impact would be further reduced by the project applicant(s)' compliance with their obligations under Measure W to provide "for the funding and construction of all necessary school facilities for the Area, so that Folsom residents north of Highway 50 are not required to pay for the construction of new school facilities serving the Area and existing schools are not overcrowded by development in the Area." The **indirect** impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

RIM

Based on student-yield generation rates shown in Table 3A.14-2 above, implementation of the Resource Impact Minimization Alternative would generate approximately 2,996 new elementary school students (grades K–5) at project buildout. This would be approximately 189 more elementary school students than under the Proposed Project Alternative. Once constructed, the five proposed elementary schools in the SPA would accommodate all 2,996 new students and would have capacity for an additional 4 students. Therefore, the proposed elementary schools would have sufficient capacity to meet the demands of project-generated elementary school students and would not result in a shortfall of elementary school services or facilities.

The project applicant(s) would pay the state-mandated school impact fees to FCUSD. This fee is typically an insufficient amount to fund 100% of new school facility construction and operation. The California Legislature has declared that the school impact fee is deemed to be full and adequate mitigation under CEQA. (California Government Code Section 65996.) In addition, Measure W would require the project applicant(s) to fund and construct sufficient elementary school facilities to serve the project. Therefore, implementation of the Resource Impact Minimization Alternative would have a **less-than-significant**, **direct** impact on school services and facilities in the long term. The **indirect** impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. ***[Lesser]***

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

CD

Based on student-yield generation rates shown in Table 3A.14-2 above, implementation of the Centralized Development Alternative would generate approximately 2,363 new elementary school students (grades K–5) at project buildout. This would be approximately 444 fewer elementary school students than under the Proposed Project Alternative.

The Centralized Development Alternative proposes four elementary schools, which would be one less than the Proposed Project Alternative. Using this average as the assured capacity of schools to be built on-site, the four proposed school sites would have a total capacity of 2,400 students. Once constructed, the four proposed elementary schools in the SPA would accommodate all 2,363 new students and would have capacity for an additional 37 students. Therefore, the proposed elementary school would have sufficient capacity to meet the demands of project-generated elementary school students and would not result in a shortfall of elementary school services or facilities.

The project applicant(s) would pay the state-mandated school impact fees to FCUSD. This fee is typically an insufficient amount to fund 100% of new school facility construction and operation. However, The California Legislature has declared that the school impact fee is deemed to be full and adequate mitigation under CEQA. (California Government Code Section 65996.) In addition, Measure W would require the project applicant(s) to fund and construct sufficient elementary school facilities to serve the project. Therefore, implementation of the Centralized Development Alternative would have a **less-than-significant**, **direct** impact on school services and facilities in the long term. The **indirect** impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. ***[Lesser]***

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

RHD

Based on student-yield generation rates shown in Table 3A.14-2 above, implementation of the Reduced Hillside Development Alternative would generate approximately 2,556 new elementary school students (grades K–5) at project buildout. This would be approximately 251 fewer elementary school students than under the Proposed Project Alternative. Once constructed, the five proposed elementary schools in the SPA would accommodate all 2,556 new students and would have capacity for an additional 444 students. Therefore, the proposed elementary schools would have sufficient capacity to meet the demands of project-generated elementary school students and would not result in a shortfall of elementary school services or facilities.

The project applicant(s) would pay the state-mandated school impact fees to FCUSD. This fee is typically an insufficient amount to fund 100% of new school facility construction and operation. The California Legislature has declared that the school impact fee is deemed to be full and adequate mitigation under CEQA. (California Government Code Section 65996.) In addition, Measure W would require the project applicant(s) to fund and construct sufficient elementary school facilities to serve the project. Therefore, implementation of the Reduced Hillside Development Alternative would have a **less-than-significant**, **direct** impact on school services and facilities in the long term. The **indirect** impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. ***[Lesser]***

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

Off-Site Elements

Construction of the off-site freeway interchange improvements, the sewer force main, the drainage basin in Sacramento County, and the two roadway connections into El Dorado Hills would not involve construction of new housing or development of new businesses that would generate elementary school students. Therefore, the off-site elements would have **no direct** or **indirect** impact on elementary school services and facilities.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

IMPACT 3A.14-6 Increased Demand for Public Middle and High School Facilities and Services. *Project implementation would increase demand for middle schools (grades 6–8) and high schools (grades 9–12) to serve the project.*

On-Site Elements

NP

The No Project Alternative could include development of a maximum of 44 residential units and generate approximately 128 new residents in Sacramento County under the existing Sacramento County agricultural zoning classification AG-80, and no off-site water facilities would be constructed. Based on student-yield generation rates shown in Table 3A.14-2, the No Project Alternative would generate approximately 16 new middle school students (grades 6–8) and 19 new high school students (grades 9–12). Existing middle schools and high schools in Sacramento County would have sufficient capacity to accommodate these students. Therefore, impacts on middle and high school facilities and services would be **direct** and **less than significant**. **No indirect** impacts would occur. ***[Lesser]***

NCP

Based on student-yield generation rates shown in Table 3A.14-2 above, implementation of the No USACE Permit Alternative would generate approximately 710 new middle school students (grades 6–8) and approximately 756 new high school students (grades 9–12) at buildout. This would be approximately 307 fewer middle school students and 317 fewer high school students than under the Proposed Project Alternative.

The proposed middle school, with a total capacity of 900 students, would accommodate all 710 new students and would have capacity for an additional 190 students. The proposed high school, with a capacity for 2,000 students, would accommodate all 756 students and would have capacity for an additional 1,244 students. Therefore, with implementation of the No USACE Permit Alternative, the combined middle school and high school would have sufficient capacity to accommodate students living in the SPA; the project would not result in a shortfall of school services or facilities.

The project applicant(s) would pay the state-mandated school impact fees to FCUSD. This fee is typically an insufficient amount to fund 100% of new school facility construction and operation. The California Legislature has declared that the school impact fee is deemed to be full and adequate mitigation under CEQA. (California Government Code Section 65996.) In addition, Measure W would require the project applicant(s) to fund and construct sufficient middle and high school facilities to serve the project. Therefore, implementation of the No USACE Permit Alternative would have a **less-than-significant**, **direct** impact on school services and facilities in the long term. The **indirect** impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. ***[Lesser]***

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

PP

The SPA would be within the boundaries of FCUSD. Based on student-yield generation rates shown in Table 3A.14-2 above, implementation of the Proposed Project Alternative would generate approximately 1,017 new middle school students (grades 6–8) and approximately 1,073 new high school students (grades 9–12) at buildout. The proposed combined middle school and high school site would accommodate a combined campus on one 70-acre site in the south-central portion of the SPA north of White Rock Road, south of "A" Street, and east of Scott Road (see Exhibit 2-3, "Folsom South of 50 Conceptual Land Use Plan," in Chapter 2, "Alternatives").

Middle schools in FCUSD have an average capacity of 900 students (FCUSD 2008a:18). Therefore, under the Proposed Project Alternative, approximately 193 students would not be accommodated by the proposed on-site middle school. These middle schools students would likely attend Folsom Middle School, which is currently operating above capacity. The additional students from the SPA could result in overcrowding at Folsom Middle School. However, Measure W requires the project applicant(s) to fund and construct sufficient middle school facilities to serve students on the Proposed Project Alternative.

High schools in FCUSD have an average capacity of 2,000 students (FCUSD 2008a:18). The proposed high school in the SPA would accommodate all 1,073 students and would have capacity for an additional 927 students. Therefore, with implementation of the Proposed Project Alternative, the combined high school would have sufficient capacity to accommodate high school students living in the SPA; this alternative would not result in a shortfall of high school services or facilities.

As required by state law, the project applicant(s) would pay the state-mandated school impact fees to FCUSD. As of March 2008, the developer is charged Level II fees of $6.99 per square foot for residential development and $0.47 per square foot for commercial development in the FCUSD boundaries (FCUSD 2009). The City would determine the assessable square footage that would be subject to the fee at the time of development (FCUSD 2009). This fee is typically an insufficient amount to fund 100% of new school facility construction. The California Legislature has declared that the school impact fee is deemed to be full and adequate mitigation under CEQA. (California Government Code Section 65996.) In addition, Measure W would require the applicants to

Because the project applicant(s) would pay state-mandated school impact fees and fund all costs associated with construction of middle and high school facilities, and assuming that the middle school/high school is constructed, implementation of the Proposed Project Alternative would have a **less-than-significant, direct** impact on school services in the long term. This impact will be further reduced by the project applicant(s)'s compliance with their obligations under Measure W to provide "for the funding and construction of all necessary school facilities for the Area, so that Folsom residents north of Highway 50 are not required to pay for the construction of new school facilities serving the Area and existing schools are not overcrowded by development in the Area." The **indirect** impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

RIM

Based on student-yield generation rates shown in Table 3A.14-2 above, implementation of the Resource Impact Minimization Alternative would generate approximately 866 new middle school students (grades 6–8) and approximately 919 new high school students (grades 9–12) at buildout. This would be approximately 151 fewer middle school students and 154 fewer high school students than under the Proposed Project Alternative.

The proposed middle school, with a total capacity of 900 students, would accommodate all 866 new students and would have capacity for an additional 34 students. The proposed high school, with a capacity for 2,000 students, would accommodate all 919 students and would have capacity for an additional 1,081 students. Therefore, with implementation of the Resource Impact Minimization Alternative, the combined middle school and high school would have sufficient capacity to accommodate students living in the SPA; the project would not result in a shortfall of school services or facilities.

The project applicant(s) would pay the state-mandated school impact fees to FCUSD. This fee is typically an insufficient amount to fund 100% of new school facility construction and operation. The California Legislature has declared that the school impact fee is deemed to be full and adequate mitigation under CEQA. (California Government Code Section 65996.) In addition, Measure W requires the project applicant(s) to fund and construct sufficient middle and high school facilities to serve the project. Therefore, implementation of the Resource Impact

Minimization Alternative would have a **less-than-significant**, **direct** impact on school services and facilities in the long term. The **indirect** impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. ***[Lesser]***

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

CD

Based on student-yield generation rates shown in Table 3A.14-2 above, implementation of the Centralized Development Alternative would generate approximately 869 new middle school students (grades 6–8) and approximately 889 new high school students (grades 9–12) at buildout. This would be approximately 148 fewer middle school students and 184 fewer high school students than under the Proposed Project Alternative.

The proposed middle school, with a total capacity of 900 students, would accommodate all 869 new students and would have capacity for an additional 37 students. The proposed high school, with a capacity for 2,000 students, would accommodate all 889 students and would have capacity for an additional 1,111 students. Therefore, with implementation of the Centralized Development Alternative, the combined middle school and high school would have sufficient capacity to accommodate students living in the SPA; the project would not result in a shortfall of school services or facilities.

The project applicant(s) would pay the state-mandated school impact fees to FCUSD. This fee is typically an insufficient amount to fund 100% of new school facility construction and operation. The California Legislature has declared that the school impact fee is deemed to be full and adequate mitigation under CEQA. (California Government Code Section 65996.) In addition, Measure W would require the project applicant(s) to fund and construct sufficient middle and high school facilities to serve the project. Therefore, implementation of the Centralized Development Alternative would have a **less-than-significant**, **direct** impact on school services and facilities in the long term. The **indirect** impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. ***[Lesser]***

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

RHD

Based on student-yield generation rates shown in Table 3A.14-2 above, implementation of the Reduced Hillside Development Alternative would generate approximately 1,480 new middle school students (grades 6–8) and approximately 972 new high school students (grades 9–12) at buildout. This would be approximately 463 more middle school students and 101 fewer high school students than under the Proposed Project Alternative.

The proposed middle school in the SPA, with a total capacity of 900 students, approximately 580 students would not be accommodated by the proposed facility. These middle schools students would likely attend Folsom Middle School, which is currently operating above capacity. The additional students from the SPA could result in overcrowding at Folsom Middle School. However, Measure W requires the project applicant(s) to fund and construct sufficient middle school facilities to serve students on the project.

The proposed high school, with a capacity for 2,000 students, would accommodate all 972 students and would have capacity for an additional 1,028 students. Therefore, with implementation of the Reduced Hillside Development Alternative, the combined middle school and high school would have sufficient capacity to accommodate students living in the SPA; the project would not result in a shortfall of school services or facilities.

The project applicant(s) would pay the state-mandated school impact fees to FCUSD. This fee is typically an insufficient amount to fund 100% of new school facility construction and operation. The California Legislature has declared that the school impact fee is deemed to be full and adequate mitigation under CEQA. (California

Government Code Section 65996.) In addition, Measure W would require the applicants to fund and construct sufficient middle and high school facilities to serve the project. Therefore, implementation of the Reduced Hillside Development Alternative would have a **less-than-significant**, **direct** impact on school services and facilities in the long term. The **indirect** impacts of constructing these facilities are addressed throughout this EIR/EIS in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. ***[Greater]***

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

Off-Site Elements

Construction of the off-site freeway interchange improvements, the sewer force main, the drainage basin in Sacramento County, and the two roadway connections into El Dorado Hills would not involve construction of new housing or development of new businesses that would generate middle school or high school students Therefore, the off-site elements would have **no direct** or **indirect** impacts on the middle and high school services and facilities.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

3A.14.4 RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

With implementation of the mitigation measures listed above, project implementation would not result in any on-site residual significant impacts related to public services.

However, some of the off-site elements fall under the jurisdiction of El Dorado and Sacramento Counties, or Caltrans; therefore, neither the City nor the project applicant(s) would have control over the timing or implementation of mitigation measures for these off-site elements. Because the City does not control implementation of mitigation measures for off-site improvements constructed in areas under the jurisdiction of El Dorado and Sacramento Counties, or Caltrans, impact 3A.14-1 is considered **potentially significant and unavoidable** for off-site improvements which would be located in Sacramento County, El Dorado County, or Caltrans jurisdiction.